

STEVEN G. KALAR
Federal Public Defender
GALIA A. PHILLIPS
Assistant Federal Public Defender
19th Floor Federal Building
450 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102
(415) 436-7700

Counsel for Defendant Walter

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

YAOWAPHA RITDET,
STEVE WALTER,

Defendants.

No. CR 14-0215 EMC

**STIPULATION AND ~~[PROPOSED]~~
ORDER FOR CONTINUANCE OF
STATUS CONFERENCE
AND EXCLUSION OF TIME**

The parties in this case agree and jointly request the Court to move the hearing in the above captioned case from September 23, 2015 to November 11, 2015 at 2:30 pm. The basis for this request is that the parties have been in plea discussions and the AUSA is waiting to hear back from the DOJ Tax Division. In addition, the government has more discovery to provide.

The parties concur that granting the exclusion would allow the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of counsel and continuity of counsel. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv). The parties also agree that the ends of justice served by granting such an exclusion of time for the purposes of effective preparation of counsel outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A).

Accordingly, due to the reasons stated above, the parties jointly move to continue the

1 status hearing from September 23, 2015 to November 11, 2015 at 2:30 pm.

2 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

3 Dated: September 22, 2015

4 /s/
JOSE OLIVERA
5 Assistant United States Attorney

6
7 Dated: September 22, 2015

8 /s/
GALIA AMRAM PHILLIPS
Attorney for Defendant Walter

9
10 Dated: September 22, 2015

11 /s/
EMILY J. KINGSTON
Attorney for Defendant Ritdet

[PROPOSED] ORDER

For the reasons stated above the Court hereby CONTINUES the hearing in the
aforementioned case from September 23, 2015 to November ¹⁸~~11~~, 2015 at 2:30 pm. The Court
further finds that the exclusion from the time limits of this period applicable under 18 U.S.C. §
3161 is warranted and that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best
interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. Denying the requested exclusion of
time would deprive the defendant effective preparation of counsel, taking into account the
exercise of due diligence. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 9/22/15

